

HYPERBOLIC GEOMETRY ON THE UNIT BALL OF $B(\mathcal{H})^n$ AND DILATION THEORY

GELU POPESCU

ABSTRACT. In this paper we continue our investigation concerning the hyperbolic geometry on the noncommutative ball

$$[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^- := \left\{ (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^n : \|X_1 X_1^* + \dots + X_n X_n^*\|^{1/2} \leq 1 \right\},$$

where $B(\mathcal{H})$ is the algebra of all bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and its implications to noncommutative function theory. The central object is an intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$ of the minimal isometric dilations of $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$, which establishes a strong connection between noncommutative hyperbolic geometry on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and multivariable dilation theory. The goal of this paper is to study the operator $L_{B,A}$ and its connections to the hyperbolic metric δ on the Harnack parts Δ of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$. In particular, we show that

$$\delta(A, B) = \ln \max \left\{ \|L_{A,B}\|, \|L_{A,B}^{-1}\| \right\}$$

for any $A, B \in \Delta$, and express $\|L_{B,A}\|$ in terms of the reconstruction operators R_A and R_B . We study the geometric structure of the operator $L_{B,A}$ and obtain new characterizations for the Harnack domination (resp. equivalence) in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$.

Finally, given a contractive free holomorphic function $F := (F_1, \dots, F_m)$ with coefficients in $B(\mathcal{E})$ and $z, \xi \in \mathbb{B}_n$, the open unit ball of $\mathbb{C}^n$, we prove that $F(z)$ is Harnack equivalent to $F(\xi)$ and

$$\|L_{F(z), F(\xi)}\| \leq \|L_{z, \xi}\| = \left(\frac{1 + \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2}{1 - \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2} \right)^{1/2},$$

where φ_z is the involutive automorphism of $\mathbb{B}_n$ which takes 0 into z . This result implies a Schwartz-Pick lemma for operator-valued multipliers of the Drury-Arveson space, with respect to the hyperbolic metric.

INTRODUCTION

In [30], we introduced a hyperbolic metric δ on the noncommutative ball

$$[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1 := \left\{ (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^n : \|X_1 X_1^* + \dots + X_n X_n^*\|^{1/2} < 1 \right\}.$$

This metric is a noncommutative extension of the Poincaré-Bergman ([3]) metric β_n on the open unit ball $\mathbb{B}_n := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : \|z\|_2 < 1\}$, which is defined by

$$\beta_n(z, w) := \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1 + \|\varphi_z(w)\|_2}{1 - \|\varphi_z(w)\|_2}, \quad z, w \in \mathbb{B}_n,$$

where φ_z is the involutive automorphism of $\mathbb{B}_n$ that interchanges 0 and z . We proved that δ is invariant under the action of the group $\text{Aut}([B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1)$ of all free holomorphic automorphisms of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$, and showed that the δ -topology and the usual operator norm topology coincide on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. Moreover, we proved that $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ is a complete metric space with respect to the hyperbolic metric and obtained an explicit formula for δ in terms of the reconstruction operator. A Schwarz-Pick lemma for bounded free holomorphic functions on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$, with respect to the hyperbolic metric, was also obtained. The

Date: September 15, 2008.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 46L52; 32F45; 47A20; Secondary: 47A56; 32Q45.

Key words and phrases. Noncommutative hyperbolic geometry; Noncommutative function theory; Dilation theory; Poincaré-Bergman metric, Harnack part; Hyperbolic distance; Free holomorphic function; Poisson transform; Automorphism group; Row contraction; Fock space; Schwarz-Pick lemma.

Research supported in part by an NSF grant.

results from [30] make connections between noncommutative function theory (see [24], [26], [28], [29]) and classical results in hyperbolic complex analysis and geometry (see [11], [12], [13], [31], [36]).

In this paper we continue to study the noncommutative hyperbolic geometry on the unit ball of $B(\mathcal{H})^n$, its connections with multivariable dilation theory, and its implications to noncommutative function theory.

To present our results, we recall ([30]) a few definitions. Let $A := (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ and $B := (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$. We say that A is Harnack dominated by B if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{Re} p(A_1, \dots, A_n) \leq c^2 \operatorname{Re} p(B_1, \dots, B_n)$$

for any noncommutative polynomial with matrix-valued coefficients $p \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n] \otimes M_m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\operatorname{Re} p \geq 0$, i.e., $\operatorname{Re} p(X_1, \dots, X_n) \geq 0$ for any $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{K})^n]_1$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is an infinite dimensional Hilbert space. In this case, we denote $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B$.

In Section 1, we obtain a characterization of the Harnack domination $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B$ in terms of an intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$ of the minimal isometric dilations of the row contractions A and B . More precisely, we prove that if $V := (V_1, \dots, V_n)$ on $\mathcal{K}_A \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $W := (W_1, \dots, W_n)$ on $\mathcal{K}_B \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ are the minimal isometric dilations of A and B , respectively, and $c \geq 1$, then $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B$ if and only if there is an operator $L_{B,A} \in B(\mathcal{K}_B, \mathcal{K}_A)$ with $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$ such that $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and

$$L_{B,A}W_i = V_iL_{B,A}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

The central object of this paper is the intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$ which establishes a bridge between noncommutative hyperbolic geometry on the unit ball of $B(\mathcal{H})^n$ and multivariable dilation theory.

In Section 2, we obtain some results concerning the Harnack domination on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and the reconstruction operator

$$R_X := X_1^* \otimes R_1 + \dots + X_n^* \otimes R_n, \quad X := (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1,$$

associated with the right creation operators $R_1, \dots, R_n$ on the full Fock space with n generators. Using basic facts about noncommutative Poisson transforms ([24]) on Cuntz-Toeplitz algebras ([5]), we prove that if A and B are in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and $c > 0$, then $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B$ if and only if $R_A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c R_B$. This result is needed in the next sections.

We recall ([30]) that $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ are called Harnack equivalent (and denote $A \stackrel{H}{\sim}_c B$) if and only if there exists $c \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \operatorname{Re} p(B_1, \dots, B_n) \leq \operatorname{Re} p(A_1, \dots, A_n) \leq c^2 \operatorname{Re} p(B_1, \dots, B_n)$$

for any noncommutative polynomial with matrix-valued coefficients $p \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n] \otimes M_m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\operatorname{Re} p \geq 0$. The equivalence classes with respect to $\stackrel{H}{\sim}$ are called Harnack parts of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and are noncommutative analogues of the Gleason parts of the Gelfand spectrum of a function algebra (see [10]). In Section 3, using noncommutative dilation theory for row contractions ([16], [17]), we obtain several results concerning the Harnack parts of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$.

We introduced in [30] a hyperbolic metric δ on any Harnack part Δ of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ by setting

$$\delta(A, B) := \ln \inf \left\{ c \geq 1 : A \stackrel{H}{\sim}_c B \right\}, \quad A, B \in \Delta.$$

In Section 4, we express the hyperbolic distance in terms of the operator $L_{B,A}$ by proving that

$$\delta(A, B) = \ln \max \left\{ \|L_{A,B}\|, \|L_{A,B}^{-1}\| \right\}$$

for any $A, B \in \Delta$. Using a characterization of the Harnack equivalence on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ in terms of free pluriharmonic kernels (see [30]), we obtain an explicit formula for the norm of the intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$ in terms of the reconstruction operators R_A and R_B . More precisely, we prove that if $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$, then

$$\|L_{B,A}\| = \|C_A C_B^{-1}\|,$$

where $C_X := (\Delta_X \otimes I)(I - R_X)^{-1}$. Similar result holds if $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and $A \overset{H}{\prec} B$.

Section 5 deals with the geometric structure of the operator $L_{B,A}$. We show that if $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$, then $A \overset{H}{\prec} B$ if and only if there exist two bounded linear operators Ω and Θ satisfying certain analytic properties such that

$$L_{B,A}^* = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ \Omega & \Theta \end{bmatrix}.$$

As consequences, we obtain new characterizations for the Harnack domination (resp. equivalence) in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$.

In Section 6, we obtain a Schwartz-Pick lemma for contractive free holomorphic functions on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ with respect to the intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$. More precisely, given a contractive free holomorphic function $F := (F_1, \dots, F_m)$ with coefficients in $B(\mathcal{E})$ and $z, \xi \in \mathbb{B}_n$, we prove that $F(z) \overset{H}{\sim} F(\xi)$ and

$$\|L_{F(z), F(\xi)}\| \leq \|L_{z, \xi}\|.$$

As a consequence, we deduce that

$$\delta(F(z), F(\xi)) \leq \delta(z, \xi),$$

where δ is the hyperbolic metric. We mention that the map $\mathbb{B}_n \ni z \mapsto F(z) \in B(\mathcal{E})^m$ is a contractive operator-valued multiplier of the Drury-Arveson space (see [6], [2]).

Finally, we want to acknowledge that we were strongly influenced in writing this paper and [30] by the work of Foiaş concerning Harnack parts of contractions ([8]) and by the work of Suciu on the hyperbolic distance between two contractions ([32], [33]). The present paper is dedicated to Ciprian Foiaş on his 75th anniversary.

1. HARNACK TYPE DOMINATION ON $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ AND DILATIONS

In this section, we obtain characterizations for the Harnack domination $A \overset{H}{\prec}_c B$ in terms of multi-Toeplitz kernels on free semigroups, and in terms of an intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$ of the minimal isometric dilations of the row contractions A and B .

Let H_n be an n -dimensional complex Hilbert space with orthonormal basis $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n$, where $n = 1, 2, \dots$, or $n = \infty$. We consider the full Fock space of H_n defined by

$$F^2(H_n) := \mathbb{C}1 \oplus \bigoplus_{k \geq 1} H_n^{\otimes k},$$

where $H_n^{\otimes k}$ is the (Hilbert) tensor product of k copies of H_n . Define the left (resp. right) creation operators S_i (resp. R_i), $i = 1, \dots, n$, acting on $F^2(H_n)$ by setting

$$S_i \varphi := e_i \otimes \varphi, \quad \varphi \in F^2(H_n),$$

(resp. $R_i \varphi := \varphi \otimes e_i$, $\varphi \in F^2(H_n)$.) The noncommutative disc algebra $\mathcal{A}_n$ (resp. $\mathcal{R}_n$) is the norm closed algebra generated by the left (resp. right) creation operators and the identity. The noncommutative analytic Toeplitz algebra F_n^∞ (resp. R_n^∞) is the weakly closed version of $\mathcal{A}_n$ (resp. $\mathcal{R}_n$). These algebras were introduced ([19] and [23]) in connection with a noncommutative von Neumann type inequality (see [35] for the classical case $n = 1$). For basic results concerning completely bounded maps and operator spaces we refer to [14], [15], and [7].

Let $\mathbb{F}_n^+$ be the unital free semigroup on n generators $g_1, \dots, g_n$ and the identity g_0 . The length of $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ is defined by $|\alpha| := 0$ if $\alpha = g_0$ and $|\alpha| := k$ if $\alpha = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_k}$, where $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^n$, where $B(\mathcal{H})$ is the algebra of all bounded linear operators on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, we set $X_\alpha := X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_k}$ and $X_{g_0} := I_{\mathcal{H}}$. We denote $e_\alpha := e_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_k}$ if $\alpha = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_k} \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and $e_{g_0} := 1$. Note that $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+}$ is an orthonormal basis for the full Fock space $F^2(H_n)$.

Free pluriharmonic functions arise in the study of free holomorphic functions on the noncommutative open unit ball $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. We recall [26] that a map $F : [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}) \otimes_{\min} B(\mathcal{E})$ is free holomorphic function on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ with coefficients in $B(\mathcal{E})$ if there exist $A_{(\alpha)} \in B(\mathcal{E})$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$,

such that $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} A_{(\alpha)}^* A_{(\alpha)} \right\|^{1/2k} \leq 1$ and $F(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} X_{\alpha} \otimes A_{(\alpha)}$, where the series converges in the operator norm topology for any $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. We say that $h : [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}) \otimes_{\min} B(\mathcal{E})$ is a self-adjoint free pluriharmonic function on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ if $h = \operatorname{Re} f$ for some free holomorphic function f . An arbitrary free pluriharmonic function is a linear combination of self-adjoint free pluriharmonic functions. A free pluriharmonic functions on the noncommutative ball $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ has the form

$$G(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} X_{\alpha}^* \otimes B_{(\alpha)} + I \otimes A_{(0)} \otimes I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} X_{\alpha} \otimes A_{(\alpha)},$$

where the series are convergent in the operator norm topology for any $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. We also recall that G is called positive if $G(X_1, \dots, X_n) \geq 0$ for any $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{K})^n]_1$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is an infinite dimensional Hilbert space.

Let $A := (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ and $B := (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$. As in [30], we say that A is Harnack dominated by B , and denote $A \stackrel{H}{\prec} B$, if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{Rep}(A_1, \dots, A_n) \leq c^2 \operatorname{Rep}(B_1, \dots, B_n)$$

for any noncommutative polynomial with matrix-valued coefficients $p \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n] \otimes M_m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\operatorname{Rep} p \geq 0$. When we want to emphasize the constant c , we write $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B$. In [30], we proved that if $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and $c > 0$, then

$$(1.1) \quad A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B \quad \text{if and only if} \quad P(rA, R) \leq c^2 P(rB, R) \quad \text{for any } r \in [0, 1),$$

where $P(X, R)$ is the free pluriharmonic Poisson kernel associated with $X := (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ given by

$$P(X, R) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} X_{\alpha}^* \otimes R_{\tilde{\alpha}} + I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} X_{\alpha} \otimes R_{\alpha}^*$$

and the series are convergent in the operator norm topology.

In what follows we obtain a characterization of Harnack domination in terms of multi-Toeplitz kernels on free semigroups.

A few more notations and definitions are necessary. If $\omega, \gamma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, we say that $\omega >_l \gamma$ if there is $\sigma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+ \setminus \{g_0\}$ such that $\omega = \gamma\sigma$ and set $\omega \setminus_l \gamma := \sigma$. We denote by $\tilde{\alpha}$ the reverse of $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, i.e., $\tilde{\alpha} = g_{i_k} \cdots g_{i_1}$ if $\alpha = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_k} \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. An operator-valued positive semidefinite kernel on the free semigroup $\mathbb{F}_n^+$ is a map $K : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ with the property that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for each choice of vectors $h_1, \dots, h_k$ in $\mathcal{H}$, and $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ in $\mathbb{F}_n^+$ the inequality

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^k \langle K(\sigma_i, \sigma_j) h_j, h_i \rangle \geq 0$$

holds. Such a kernel is called multi-Toeplitz if it has the following properties: $K(\alpha, \alpha) = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and

$$K(\sigma, \omega) = \begin{cases} K(g_0, \omega \setminus_l \sigma) & \text{if } \omega >_l \sigma \\ K(\sigma \setminus_l \omega, g_0) & \text{if } \sigma >_l \omega \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If $X := (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$, we define the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_X : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ by

$$K_X(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} X_{\beta \setminus_l \alpha} & \text{if } \beta >_l \alpha \\ I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ X_{\alpha \setminus_l \beta}^* & \text{if } \alpha >_l \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The first result is a characterization for Harnack domination in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ in terms of multi-Toeplitz kernels on free semigroups.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $A := (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ and $B := (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and let $c > 0$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $A \xrightarrow[c]{H} B$;
- (ii) $K_A \leq c^2 K_B$, where K_X is the multi-Toeplitz kernel associated with $X \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$;

Proof. We recall that $e_\alpha := e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_k}$ if $\alpha = g_{i_1} \dots g_{i_k} \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and $e_{g_0} := 1$, and that $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+}$ is an orthonormal basis for the full Fock space $F^2(H_n)$. We prove now that (i) $\implies$ (ii). First, we show that

$$(1.2) \quad \left\langle P(X, rR) \left(\sum_{|\beta| \leq q} h_\beta \otimes e_\beta \right), \sum_{|\gamma| \leq q} h_\gamma \otimes e_\gamma \right\rangle = \sum_{|\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} \langle K_{X,r}(\gamma, \beta) h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle,$$

where the multi-Toeplitz kernel $K_{X,r} : \mathbb{F}_n^+ \times \mathbb{F}_n^+ \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$, $r \in (0, 1)$, is defined by

$$K_{X,r}(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} r^{|\beta| \setminus \iota \alpha} X_{\beta \setminus \iota \alpha} & \text{if } \beta >_\iota \alpha \\ I & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \\ r^{|\alpha| \setminus \iota \beta} (X_{\alpha \setminus \iota \beta})^* & \text{if } \alpha >_\iota \beta \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, if $\{h_\beta\}_{|\beta| \leq q} \subset \mathcal{H}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\langle \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} X_\alpha^* \otimes r^k R_{\tilde{\alpha}} \right) \left(\sum_{|\beta| \leq q} h_\beta \otimes e_\beta \right), \sum_{|\gamma| \leq q} h_\gamma \otimes e_\gamma \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \left\langle \sum_{|\beta| \leq q} X_\alpha^* h_\beta \otimes r^k R_{\tilde{\alpha}} e_\beta, \sum_{|\gamma| \leq q} h_\gamma \otimes e_\gamma \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \sum_{|\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} r^{|\alpha|} \langle e_{\beta\alpha}, e_\gamma \rangle \langle X_\alpha^* h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \geq \beta; |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} r^{|\gamma| \setminus \iota \beta} \langle X_{\gamma \setminus \iota \beta}^* h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \geq \beta; |\beta|, |\gamma| \leq q} \langle K_{X,r}(\gamma, \beta) h_\beta, h_\gamma \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, taking into account that $K_{X,r}(\gamma, \beta) = K_{X,r}^*(\beta, \gamma)$, we deduce relation (1.2). Consequently, the condition $P(rA, R) \leq c^2 P(rB, R)$ for any $r \in [0, 1)$ implies

$$[K_{A,r}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q} \leq c^2 [K_{B,r}(\alpha, \beta)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq q}$$

for any $0 < r < 1$ and $q = 0, 1, \dots$. Taking $r \rightarrow 1$, we obtain item (ii).

Assume now that (ii) holds. Since $c^2 K_B - K_A$ is a positive semidefinite multi-Toeplitz operator, due to [22] (see also the proof of Theorem 5.2 from [29]), we find a completely positive linear map $\mu : C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{E})$ such that

$$\mu(S_\alpha) = c^2 K_B(g_0, \alpha) - K_A(g_0, \alpha) = c^2 B_\alpha - A_\alpha$$

for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Since $P(rS, R) \geq 0$ for $r \in [0, 1)$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu \otimes \text{id})[P(rS, R)] &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} [c^2 B_\alpha^* - A_\alpha^*] \otimes R_{\tilde{\alpha}} + (c^2 B_0 - A_0) \otimes I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} [c^2 B_\alpha - A_\alpha] \otimes R_{\tilde{\alpha}}^* \\ &= c^2 P(rB, R) - P(rA, R) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which, due to (1.1), implies (i). This completes the proof. $\square$

An n -tuple $T := (T_1, \dots, T_n)$ of bounded linear operators acting on a common Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is called contractive (or row contraction) if

$$T_1 T_1^* + \dots + T_n T_n^* \leq I_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

For simplicity, throughout this paper, $[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ denotes either the n -tuple $(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ or the operator row matrix $[T_1 \ \dots \ T_n]$. The defect operators associated with a row contraction $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$ are

$$(1.3) \quad \Delta_T := \left(I_{\mathcal{H}} - \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right)^{1/2} \in B(\mathcal{H}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{T^*} := ([\delta_{ij} I_{\mathcal{H}} - T_i^* T_j]_{n \times n})^{1/2} \in B(\mathcal{H}^{(n)}),$$

while the defect spaces are $\mathcal{D}_T := \overline{\Delta_T \mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{T^*} := \overline{\Delta_{T^*} \mathcal{H}^{(n)}}$, where $\mathcal{H}^{(n)}$ denotes the direct sum of n copies of $\mathcal{H}$. We say that an n -tuple $V := [V_1, \dots, V_n]$ of isometries on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}_T \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ is a minimal isometric dilation of T if the following properties are satisfied:

- (i) $V_1 V_1^* + \dots + V_n V_n^* \leq I_{\mathcal{K}_T}$;
- (ii) $V_i^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = T_i^*$, $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- (iii) $\mathcal{K}_T = \bigvee_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} V_{\alpha} \mathcal{H}$.

The isometric dilation theorem for row contractions (see [16], [4], [9]) asserts that every row contraction T has a minimal isometric dilation V which is uniquely determined up to an isomorphism.

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and let $V := [V_1, \dots, V_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_A \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $W := [W_1, \dots, W_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_B \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ be the minimal isometric dilations of A and B , respectively. If $c \geq 1$, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B$;
- (ii) *there is an operator $L_{B,A} \in B(\mathcal{K}_B, \mathcal{K}_A)$ with $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$ such that $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and*

$$L_{B,A} W_i = V_i L_{B,A}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Assume that (i) holds. According to Theorem 1.1, we have $K_A \leq c^2 K_B$, where K_X is the multi-Toeplitz kernel associated with $X \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$.

Since $V := [V_1, \dots, V_n]$ is the minimal isometric dilation of $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$, we have $\mathcal{K}_A = \bigvee_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} V_{\alpha} \mathcal{H}$ and $V_{\alpha}^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = A_{\alpha}^*$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Similar properties hold for W and B . Hence, and taking into account that $V_1, \dots, V_n$ and $W_1, \dots, W_n$ are isometries with orthogonal ranges, respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} V_{\alpha} h_{\alpha} \right\|^2 &= \sum_{\alpha > \iota \beta, |\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m} \langle V_{\alpha \setminus \iota \beta} h_{\alpha}, h_{\beta} \rangle + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \langle h_{\alpha}, h_{\alpha} \rangle + \sum_{\beta > \iota \alpha, |\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m} \langle V_{\beta \setminus \iota \alpha}^* h_{\alpha}, h_{\beta} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\alpha > \iota \beta, |\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m} \langle A_{\alpha \setminus \iota \beta} h_{\alpha}, h_{\beta} \rangle + \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} \langle h_{\alpha}, h_{\alpha} \rangle + \sum_{\beta > \iota \alpha, |\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m} \langle A_{\beta \setminus \iota \alpha}^* h_{\alpha}, h_{\beta} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m, |\beta| \leq m} \langle K_A(\beta, \alpha) h_{\alpha}, h_{\beta} \rangle = \left\langle [K_A(\beta, \alpha)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m} \mathbf{h}_m, \mathbf{h}_m \right\rangle \end{aligned}$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{h}_m \in \oplus_{|\alpha| \leq m} \mathcal{H}_{\alpha}$, where each $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha}$ is a copy of $\mathcal{H}$. Similarly, one can show that

$$\left\| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} W_{\alpha} h_{\alpha} \right\|^2 = \left\langle [K_B(\beta, \alpha)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m} \mathbf{h}_m, \mathbf{h}_m \right\rangle.$$

Since $K_A \leq c^2 K_B$, we deduce that

$$\left\| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} V_{\alpha} h_{\alpha} \right\| \leq c \left\| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} W_{\alpha} h_{\alpha} \right\|.$$

Consequently, we can define an operator $L_{B,A} : \mathcal{K}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_A$ by setting

$$(1.4) \quad L_{B,A} \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} W_\alpha h_\alpha \right) := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} V_\alpha h_\alpha$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_\alpha \in \mathcal{H}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Due to the considerations above, $L_{B,A}$ is a bounded operator with $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$. Note that since $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$, we have $\|L_{B,A}\| \geq 1$. One can easily see that $L_{B,A}W_i = V_i L_{B,A}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore, (ii) holds.

Conversely, assume that there is an operator $L_{B,A} \in B(\mathcal{K}_B, \mathcal{K}_A)$ with norm $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$ such that $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $L_{B,A}W_i = V_i L_{B,A}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence, we deduce that $L_{B,A} \left(\sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} W_\alpha h_\alpha \right) = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} V_\alpha h_\alpha$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $h_\alpha \in \mathcal{H}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Since $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} V_\alpha h_\alpha \right\|^2 \leq c^2 \left\| \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} W_\alpha h_\alpha \right\|^2,$$

which is equivalent to the inequality

$$\left\langle [K_A(\beta, \alpha)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m} \mathbf{h}_m, \mathbf{h}_m \right\rangle \leq c^2 \left\langle [K_B(\beta, \alpha)]_{|\alpha|, |\beta| \leq m} \mathbf{h}_m, \mathbf{h}_m \right\rangle$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{h}_m \in \oplus_{|\alpha| \leq m} \mathcal{H}_\alpha$. Hence, we obtain $K_A \leq c^2 K_B$. Using again Theorem 1.1, we deduce item (i). The proof is complete. $\square$

Using Theorem 1.2 and relation (1.1), we deduce the following consequences.

Corollary 1.3. *If $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and $A \overset{H}{\prec} B$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{B,A}\| &= \inf\{c \geq 1 : A \overset{H}{\prec}_c B\} \\ &= \inf\{c \geq 1 : P(rA, R) \leq c^2 P(rB, R) \text{ for any } r \in [0, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 1.4. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$. Then $A \overset{H}{\prec} B$ if and only if $\sup_{r \in [0, 1)} \|L_{rA, rB}\| < \infty$. Moreover, in this case,*

$$\|L_{A,B}\| = \sup_{r \in [0, 1)} \|L_{rA, rB}\|$$

and $r \mapsto \|L_{rA, rB}\|$ is increasing on $[0, 1)$.

Proof. Assume that $A \overset{H}{\prec} B$. Then, due to Theorem 1.2, $A \overset{H}{\prec}_c B$ if and only if there is an operator $L_{B,A} \in B(\mathcal{K}_B, \mathcal{K}_A)$ with $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$ such that $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $L_{B,A}W_i = V_i L_{B,A}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Consequently, taking $c = \|L_{B,A}\|$, we deduce that $A \overset{H}{\prec}_{\|L_{B,A}\|} B$, which due to (1.1), is equivalent to

$$P(rA, R) \leq \|L_{B,A}\|^2 P(rB, R)$$

for any $r \in [0, 1)$. Using again relation (1.1), we have $tA \overset{H}{\prec}_{\|L_{B,A}\|} tB$ for any $t \in [0, 1)$. Applying Theorem 1.2 to the operators tA and tB , we deduce that $\|L_{tA, tB}\| \leq \|L_{B,A}\|$.

Conversely, suppose that $c := \sup_{r \in [0, 1)} \|L_{rA, rB}\| < \infty$. Since $\|L_{rA, rB}\| \leq c$, Theorem 1.2 implies $rA \overset{H}{\prec}_c rB$ for any $r \in [0, 1)$. Due to (1.1), we have $P(rtA, R) \leq c^2 P(rtB, R)$ for any $t, r \in [0, 1)$. Hence, $A \overset{H}{\prec}_c B$ which, due to Theorem 1.2, implies $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$. Therefore, $\|L_{A,B}\| = \sup_{r \in [0, 1)} \|L_{rA, rB}\|$. The fact that $r \mapsto \|L_{rA, rB}\|$ is an increasing function on $[0, 1)$ follows from the latter relation. This completes the proof. $\square$

The intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$ introduced in this section will play a very important role in this paper.

2. THE RECONSTRUCTION OPERATOR AND HARNACK DOMINATION

In this section, we obtain some results concerning the reconstruction operator and Harnack equivalence on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. These results are needed in the next sections.

We need to recall from [24] a few basic facts about noncommutative Poisson transforms on Cuntz-Toeplitz algebras. Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be row contraction, i.e.,

$$T_1 T_1^* + \dots + T_n T_n^* \leq I_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

We define the defect operator $\Delta_{T,r} := (I_{\mathcal{H}} - r^2 T_1 T_1^* - \dots - r^2 T_n T_n^*)^{1/2}$ for each $0 < r \leq 1$. The noncommutative Poisson kernel associated with T is the family of operators

$$K_{T,r} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \overline{\Delta_{T,r} \mathcal{H}} \otimes F^2(H_n), \quad 0 < r \leq 1,$$

defined by

$$K_{T,r} h := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} \Delta_{T,r} T_{\alpha}^* h \otimes e_{\alpha}, \quad h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

We recall that $\{e_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+}$ is an orthonormal basis for $F^2(H_n)$. When $r = 1$, we denote $\Delta_T := \Delta_{T,1}$ and $K_T := K_{T,1}$. The operators $K_{T,r}$ are isometries if $0 < r < 1$, and

$$K_T^* K_T = I_{\mathcal{H}} - \text{SOT-} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^*.$$

Thus K_T is an isometry if and only if T is a *pure* row contraction, i.e., $\text{SOT-} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} T_{\alpha} T_{\alpha}^* = 0$. We denote by $C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n)$ the Cuntz-Toeplitz C^* -algebra generated by the left creation operators (see [5]). The noncommutative Poisson transform at $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n] \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ is the unital completely contractive linear map $P_T : C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$P_T[f] := \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} K_{T,r}^* (I_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes f) K_{T,r}, \quad f \in C^*(S_1, \dots, S_n),$$

where the limit exists in the norm topology of $B(\mathcal{H})$. Moreover, we have

$$P_T[S_{\alpha} S_{\beta}^*] = T_{\alpha} T_{\beta}^*, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+.$$

When $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$ is a pure row contraction, we have

$$P_T[f] = K_T^* (I_{\mathcal{D}_T} \otimes f) K_T,$$

where $\mathcal{D}_T = \overline{\Delta_T \mathcal{H}}$. We refer to [24], [25], and [27] for more on noncommutative Poisson transforms on C^* -algebras generated by isometries.

Consider now the particular case when $n = 1$. In this case, the free pluriharmonic Poisson kernel $P(Y, R)$ coincides with

$$Q(Y, U) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Y^{*k} \otimes U^k + I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Y^k \otimes U^{*k}, \quad \|Y\| < 1,$$

where the convergence of the series is in the operator norm topology and U is the unilateral shift acting on the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{T})$. For each contraction $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$, consider the operator-valued Poisson kernel defined by

$$K(z, T) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} z^k T^{*k} + I + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \bar{z}^k T^k, \quad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Using Theorem 1.1 from [30], we can deduce the following.

Proposition 2.1. *Let T and T' be in $[B(\mathcal{H})]_1^-$ and let $c \geq 1$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $T \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c T'$;
- (ii) $Q(rT, U) \leq c^2 Q(rT', U)$ for any $r \in [0, 1]$;
- (iii) $K(z, T) \leq c^2 K(z, T')$ for any $z \in \mathbb{D}$.

Proof. The equivalence (i) $\leftrightarrow$ (ii) follows from Theorem 1.1 of [30], in the particular case when $n = 1$. To prove the implication (ii) $\implies$ (iii), we apply the noncommutative Poisson transform (when $n = 1$) at $e^{it}I$ to the inequality (ii). We have

$$K(re^{it}, T) = (\text{id} \otimes P_{e^{it}I})[Q(rT, U)] \leq c^2(\text{id} \otimes P_{e^{it}I})[Q(rT', U)] = c^2K(re^{it}, T')$$

for any $r \in [0, 1]$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It remains to prove that (iii) $\implies$ (ii). Since

$$\left\langle (T^{*k} \otimes U^k)(h_m \otimes e^{imt}), h_p \otimes e^{ipt} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H} \otimes H^2(\mathbb{T})} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left\langle e^{ikt} T^{*k}(e^{imt} h_m), e^{ipt} h_p \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} dt$$

for any $h_m, h_p \in \mathcal{H}$ and $k, m, p \in \mathbb{N}$, we deduce that

$$\langle (c^2 Q(rT', U) - Q(rT, U)) h(e^{it}), h(e^{it}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H} \otimes H^2(\mathbb{T})} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \langle (c^2 K(re^{it}, T') - K(re^{it}, T)) h(e^{it}), h(e^{it}) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} dt$$

for any function $e^{it} \mapsto h(e^{it})$ in $\mathcal{H} \otimes H^2(\mathbb{T})$. Now, it is clear that (iii) $\implies$ (ii). The proof is complete. $\square$

The next result makes an interesting connection between Harnack domination in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and reconstruction operators.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and let $c > 0$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $A \prec_c^H B$;
- (ii) $R_A \prec_c^H R_B$, where $R_X := X_1^* \otimes R_1 + \dots + X_n^* \otimes R_n$ is the reconstruction operator associated with $X := (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and the right creation operators $R_1, \dots, R_n$.
- (iii) $R_A^* \prec_c^H R_B^*$;

Proof. Assume that (i) holds. According to Theorem 1.1 from [30], we have

$$(2.1) \quad P(rA, S) \leq c^2 P(rB, S)$$

for any $r \in [0, 1]$, where $S := (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ is the n -tuple of left creation operators. Let U be the unilateral shift on the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{T})$. Since $R_i^* R_j = \delta_{ij} I$, it is easy to see that $[U^* \otimes R_1, \dots, U^* \otimes R_n]$ is a row contraction acting from $[H^2(\mathbb{T}) \otimes F^2(H_n)]^{(n)}$ to $H^2(\mathbb{T}) \otimes F^2(H_n)$. Using the noncommutative Poisson transform at $[U^* \otimes R_1, \dots, U^* \otimes R_n]$ and inequality (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(rR_A, U) &= (\text{id} \otimes P_{[U^* \otimes R_1, \dots, U^* \otimes R_n]}) [P(rA, S)] \\ &\leq c^2 (\text{id} \otimes P_{[U^* \otimes R_1, \dots, U^* \otimes R_n]}) [P(rB, S)] \\ &= c^2 Q(rR_B, U) \end{aligned}$$

for any $r \in [0, 1]$. Applying Proposition 2.1, we deduce that $R_A \prec_c^H R_B$. Conversely, assume that (ii) holds. Using again Proposition 2.1, we have

$$(2.2) \quad K(re^{it}, R_A) \leq c^2 K(re^{it}, R_B), \quad r \in [0, 1], t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Taking $t = 0$, we deduce that $P(rA, R) \leq c^2 P(rB, R)$ for any $r \in [0, 1]$, which implies $A \prec_c^H B$. The equivalence (ii) $\leftrightarrow$ (iii) is due to Proposition 2.1 and the fact that (2.2) is equivalent to

$$K(re^{it}, R_A^*) \leq c^2 K(re^{it}, R_B^*), \quad r \in [0, 1], t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The proof is complete. $\square$

3. HARNACK TYPE EQUIVALENCE ON $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ AND DILATIONS

In this section, using noncommutative dilation theory for row contractions ([16], [17]), we obtain several results concerning the Harnack parts of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$.

Since the Harnack type domination $\overset{H}{\prec}$ is a preorder relation on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$, it induces an equivalent relation $\overset{H}{\sim}$ on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$, which we call Harnack equivalence. The equivalence classes with respect to $\overset{H}{\sim}$ are called Harnack parts of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$. It is easy to see that A and B are Harnack equivalent (denote $A \overset{H}{\sim} B$) if and only if there exists $c \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \operatorname{Re} p(B_1, \dots, B_n) \leq \operatorname{Re} p(A_1, \dots, A_n) \leq c^2 \operatorname{Re} p(B_1, \dots, B_n)$$

for any noncommutative polynomial with matrix-valued coefficients $p \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n] \otimes M_m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\operatorname{Re} p \geq 0$. We also use the notation $A \overset{H}{\sim}_c B$ if $A \overset{H}{\prec}_c B$ and $B \overset{H}{\prec}_c A$.

First we consider a few characterizations for Harnack domination in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ (other characterizations were considered in [30]).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and let $c \geq 1$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $A \overset{H}{\sim}_c B$;
- (ii) $\frac{1}{c^2} K_B \leq K_A \leq c^2 K_B$, where K_X is the multi-Toeplitz kernel associated with $X \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$;
- (iii) $R_A \overset{H}{\sim}_c R_B$, where R_X is the reconstruction operator associated with $X \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$;
- (iv) $L_{B,A}$ is an invertible operator with $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$ and $\|L_{B,A}^{-1}\| \leq c$.

Proof. The equivalences (i) $\leftrightarrow$ (ii) and (i) $\leftrightarrow$ (iv) are due to Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2, respectively. Note also that the equivalence (i) $\leftrightarrow$ (iii) follows from Theorem 2.2. $\square$

Let us recall [16] the Wold type decomposition for sequences of isometries with orthogonal ranges. Let $V := [V_1, \dots, V_n]$, $V_i \in B(\mathcal{K})$, be such that $V_i^* V_j = \delta_{ij} I$. Then $\mathcal{K}$ decomposes into an orthogonal sum $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{G}_V \oplus M_+(\mathcal{L}_V)$ such that $\mathcal{G}_V$ and $M_+(\mathcal{L}_V)$ reduce each operator V_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, and such that $(I_{\mathcal{K}} - \sum_{i=1}^n V_i V_i^*)|_{\mathcal{G}_V} = 0$ and $(V_1|_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_V)}, \dots, V_n|_{M_+(\mathcal{L}_V)})$ is unitarily equivalent to the n -tuple of left creation operators $(S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{L}_V}, \dots, S_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{L}_V})$. Moreover, the decomposition is unique and we have

$$\mathcal{G}_V = \bigcap_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\bigoplus_{|\alpha|=k} V_{\alpha} \mathcal{K}_V \right) \quad \text{and} \quad M_+(\mathcal{L}_V) = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} V_{\alpha} \mathcal{L}_V,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_V := \mathcal{K} \ominus (\oplus_{i=1}^n V_i \mathcal{K})$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and let $V := [V_1, \dots, V_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_A \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $W := [W_1, \dots, W_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_B \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ be the minimal isometric dilations of A and B , respectively. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) *If $A \overset{H}{\sim} B$, then V and W are unitarily equivalent.*
- (ii) *Let $\mathcal{K}_V = \mathcal{G}_V \oplus M(\mathcal{L}_V)$ and $\mathcal{K}_W = \mathcal{G}_W \oplus M(\mathcal{L}_W)$ be the Wold type decompositions of V and W , respectively, and let $L_{B,A}$ be the operator defined by (1.4). If $A \overset{H}{\sim} B$, then*

$$L_{B,A}^*(\mathcal{L}_V) = \mathcal{L}_W \quad \text{and} \quad L_{B,A}(\mathcal{G}_W) = \mathcal{G}_V.$$

Proof. To prove part (i), note that, due to Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 3.1, $L_{B,A}$ is an invertible operator such that $L_{B,A} W_i = V_i L_{B,A}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Applying Theorem 2.1 from [20], we deduce that V and W are unitarily equivalent. Part (ii) is a consequence of Theorem 3.1, part (iv), and the proof of Theorem 2.1 from [20]. $\square$

Corollary 3.3. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ such that $A \overset{H}{\sim} B$. Then the following properties hold.*

- (i) A is a pure row contraction if and only if B has the same property.
- (ii) $A_1 A_1^* + \cdots + A_n A_n^* = I$ if and only if $B_1 B_1^* + \cdots + B_n B_n^* = I$.
- (iii) $\text{rank } \Delta_A = \text{rank } \Delta_B$.

Proof. According to [16], A is a pure row contraction if and only if its minimal isometric dilation V is a pure row isometry, i.e., $\mathcal{K}_V = M_+(\mathcal{L}_V)$. In this case we have $\mathcal{G}_V = \{0\}$ and, since $L_{B,A}$ is invertible, part (ii) of Theorem 3.2 implies $\mathcal{G}_W = \{0\}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{K}_W = M_+(\mathcal{L}_W)$, which shows that B is a pure row contraction. To prove (ii), note that, due to [16], $A_1 A_1^* + \cdots + A_n A_n^* = I$ is and only if $V_1 V_1^* + \cdots + V_n V_n^* = I$. The Wold type decomposition for V shows that $\mathcal{K}_V = \mathcal{G}_V$. Since $L_{B,A}(\mathcal{G}_W) = \mathcal{G}_V$ and $L_{B,A} : \mathcal{K}_W \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_V$ is an invertible operator, part (ii) of Theorem 3.2 implies $\mathcal{G}_W = \mathcal{K}_W$. Therefore, we have $W_1 W_1^* + \cdots + W_n W_n^* = I$. Using again [16], we deduce that $B_1 B_1^* + \cdots + B_n B_n^* = I$.

The geometric structure of the minimal isometric dilations of row contractions (see [16]) implies that

$$\dim \mathcal{D}_A = \dim \mathcal{L}_V \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \mathcal{D}_B = \dim \mathcal{L}_W.$$

Since $L_{B,A}$ is invertible and $L_{B,A}^*(\mathcal{L}_V) = \mathcal{L}_W$, we deduce that $\dim \mathcal{L}_V = \dim \mathcal{L}_W$, which completes the proof of part (iii). $\square$

Corollary 3.4. *If $A \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ is a row isometry (or co-isometry), then the Harnack part of A reduces to $\{A\}$.*

Proof. Let A and B be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ such that $A \stackrel{H}{\sim} B$. First, assume that A is a row isometry and let $W := [W_1, \dots, W_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_B \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ be the minimal isometric dilations of B . According to Theorem 1.2, $L_{B,A} \in B(\mathcal{K}_B, \mathcal{K}_A)$ is an invertible operator such that $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and

$$L_{B,A} W_i = V_i L_{B,A}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Since A is a row isometry, we have $\mathcal{K}_A = \mathcal{H}$ and $V = A$. Now, one can easily see that $\mathcal{K}_B = \mathcal{H}$, and $W_i = B_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence $L_{B,A} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and the intertwining relation above implies $W_i = A_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Consequently, $A = B$.

Now, assume that A is a co-isometry, i.e., $A_1 A_1^* + \cdots + A_n A_n^* = I$. Setting $R_A := \sum_{i=1}^n A_i^* \otimes R_i$, we have $R_A^* R_A = I$. On the other hand, due to Theorem 3.1, $A \stackrel{H}{\sim} B$ if and only if $R_A \stackrel{H}{\sim} R_B$. Applying the first part of this corollary when $n = 1$ and A and B are replaced by R_A and R_B , respectively, we deduce that $R_A = R_B$. Consequently, $A = B$, which completes the proof. $\square$

The characteristic function associated with an arbitrary row contraction $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$, $T_i \in B(\mathcal{H})$, was introduced in [17] (see [34] for the classical case $n = 1$) and it was proved to be a complete unitary invariant for completely non-coisometric (c.n.c.) row contractions. The characteristic function of T is a multi-analytic operator with respect to $S_1, \dots, S_n$,

$$\tilde{\Theta}_T : F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_T,$$

with the formal Fourier representation

$$\Theta_T(R_1, \dots, R_n) := -I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes T + (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Delta_T) \left(I_{F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{H}} - \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \otimes T_i^* \right)^{-1} \\ [R_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, R_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Delta_{T^*}),$$

where $R_1, \dots, R_n$ are the right creation operators on the full Fock space $F^2(H_n)$. More precisely, we have

$$\tilde{\Theta}_T = \text{SOT-}\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \Theta_T(rR_1, \dots, rR_n).$$

For definitions and basic facts concerning multi-analytic operators on Fock spaces we refer to Section 5 and [17]–[21].

We obtained in [17] a functional model for c.n.c row contractions. In the particular case when T is a pure row contraction, we proved that T is unitarily equivalent to the model row contraction

$$\mathbb{T} := (P_{\mathbb{H}}(S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_T})|_{\mathbb{H}}, \dots, P_{\mathbb{H}}(S_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_T})|_{\mathbb{H}}),$$

where $P_{\mathbb{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection on

$$\mathbb{H}_T := [F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_T] \ominus \tilde{\Theta}_T(F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{T^*})$$

and $S_1, \dots, S_n$ are the left creation operators on the full Fock space $F^2(H_n)$. In this case, the minimal isometric dilation of $\mathbb{T}$ is $[S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_T}, \dots, S_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_T}]$.

Now, we can show that there is a strong connection between the operator $L_{B,A}$, which is essentially a multi-analytic operator, and the characteristic functions of A and B .

Theorem 3.5. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be pure row contractions with the property that $A \stackrel{H}{\sim} B$. Let $\tilde{\Theta}_A : F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{A^*} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_A$ and $\tilde{\Theta}_B : F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_B$ be the characteristic functions of A and B , respectively. Then there is an invertible multi-analytic operators $L : F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_B \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_A$ such that*

$$L^* \tilde{\Theta}_A[F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{A^*}] = \tilde{\Theta}_B[F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}].$$

Proof. Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and let $V := [V_1, \dots, V_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_A \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $W := [W_1, \dots, W_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_B \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ be the minimal isometric dilations of A and B , respectively. Since A and B are pure row contraction we have $\mathcal{K}_A = M_+(\mathcal{L}_V)$ and $\mathcal{K}_B = M_+(\mathcal{L}_W)$. According to Theorem 1.2, $L_{B,A} : M_+(\mathcal{L}_W) \rightarrow M_+(\mathcal{L}_V)$ is an invertible operator such that $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and

$$L_{B,A}W_i = V_iL_{B,A}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We recall that the *Fourier transform* $\Phi_V : M_+(\mathcal{L}_V) \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{L}_V$ is a unitary operator defined by $\Phi_V(V_\alpha \ell) := e_\alpha \otimes \ell$ for any $\ell \in \mathcal{L}_V$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$. Note that $\Phi_V V_i = (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{L}_V})\Phi_V$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Similarly one can define the Fourier transform Φ_W . Note that the operator

$$\Gamma := \Phi_V L_{B,A} \Phi_W^* : F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{L}_W \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{L}_V$$

has the property that $\Gamma(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{L}_W}) = (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{L}_V})\Gamma$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Now, using the identification of $\mathcal{L}_V$ and $\mathcal{L}_W$ with $\mathcal{D}_A$ and $\mathcal{D}_B$, respectively (see [17]), we deduce that there is an invertible multi-analytic operator $L : F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_B \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_A$ such that $L(\mathbb{H}_B) = \mathbb{H}_A$. Consequently, we have

$$L^* \tilde{\Theta}_A[F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{A^*}] = \tilde{\Theta}_B[F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}],$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

4. THE OPERATOR $L_{B,A}$ AND THE HYPERBOLIC DISTANCE ON THE HARNACK PARTS OF $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$

In this section we express the hyperbolic distance δ in terms of the intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$ and obtain an explicit formula for the norm $L_{B,A}$ in terms of the reconstruction operators R_A and R_B . We also show that $\|L_{B,A}\|$ is invariant under the automorphism group $\text{Aut}([B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1)$.

In [30], we introduced a hyperbolic (*Poincaré-Bergman* type) metric δ on the Harnack parts of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ as follows. If A and B are Harnack equivalent in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$, we define

$$(4.1) \quad \delta(A, B) := \ln \omega(A, B),$$

where

$$\omega(A, B) := \inf \left\{ c \geq 1 : A \stackrel{H}{\sim}_c B \right\}.$$

Basic properties of the hyperbolic metric δ were considered in [30]. Now we establish new connections with multivariable operator theory.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$. Then $A \stackrel{H}{\sim} B$ if and only if the operator $L_{B,A}$ is invertible. In this case, $L_{B,A}^{-1} = L_{A,B}$ and*

$$\omega(A, B) = \max \{ \|L_{A,B}\|, \|L_{B,A}\| \}.$$

Proof. The first part of this lemma is a simple consequence of Theorem 1.2. To prove the last part, assume that $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B$ for some $c \geq 1$. Due to Theorem 1.2, we have $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c$ and $\|L_{A,B}\| \leq c$. Consequently,

$$(4.2) \quad \max\{\|L_{A,B}\|, \|L_{B,A}\|\} \leq \inf\left\{c \geq 1 : A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B\right\} = \omega(A, B).$$

On the other hand, set $c_0 := \|L_{B,A}\|$ and $c'_0 := \|L_{A,B}\|$. Using again Theorem 1.2, we deduce that $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_{c_0} B$ and $B \stackrel{H}{\prec}_{c'_0} A$. Hence, we deduce that $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_d B$, where $d := \max\{c_0, c'_0\}$. Consequently, $\omega(A, B) \leq d$, which together with relation (4.2) imply $\omega(A, B) = \max\{\|L_{A,B}\|, \|L_{B,A}\|\}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Using Lemma 4.1, we can express the hyperbolic metric in terms of the operator $L_{A,B}$.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ such that $A \stackrel{H}{\prec} B$. Then the metric δ satisfies the relation*

$$\delta(A, B) = \ln \max\left\{\|L_{A,B}\|, \|L_{A,B}^{-1}\|\right\}.$$

In [28], we determined the group $\text{Aut}([B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1)$ of all the free holomorphic automorphisms of the noncommutative ball $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ and showed that if $\Psi \in \text{Aut}([B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1)$ and $\lambda := \Psi^{-1}(0)$, then there is a unitary operator U on $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\Psi = \Phi_U \circ \Psi_\lambda,$$

where

$$\Phi_U(X_1, \dots, X_n) := [X_1 \cdots X_n]U, \quad (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1,$$

and

$$\Psi_\lambda = -\Theta_\lambda(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \lambda - \Delta_\lambda \left(I_K - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\lambda}_i X_i \right)^{-1} [X_1 \cdots X_n] \Delta_{\lambda^*},$$

for some $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$, where Θ_λ is the characteristic function of the row contraction λ , and $\Delta_\lambda, \Delta_{\lambda^*}$ are certain defect operators.

Let $A := (A_1, \dots, A_n)$ and $B := (B_1, \dots, B_n)$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$. We showed (see Lemma 2.3 from [28]) that

$$(4.3) \quad A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c B \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \Psi(A_1, \dots, A_n) \stackrel{H}{\prec}_c \Psi(B_1, \dots, B_n)$$

for any $\Psi \in \text{Aut}([B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1)$. Using this result, we can prove the following proposition concerning the invariance of the norm of $L_{B,A}$ under the automorphism group $\text{Aut}([B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1)$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ such that $A \stackrel{H}{\prec} B$. If $\Psi \in \text{Aut}([B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1)$, then*

$$\|L_{B,A}\| = \|L_{\Psi(B), \Psi(A)}\|.$$

Proof. Let $c_0 := \|L_{B,A}\|$. According to Theorem 1.2, we have $A \stackrel{H}{\prec}_{c_0} B$. Consequently, relation (4.3) implies $\Psi(A_1, \dots, A_n) \stackrel{H}{\prec}_{c_0} \Psi(B_1, \dots, B_n)$. Using again Theorem 1.2, we deduce that

$$(4.4) \quad \|L_{\Psi(B), \Psi(A)}\| \leq c_0 = \|L_{B,A}\|.$$

Since $\Psi \circ \Psi = \text{id}$, we can apply relation (4.4) when A and B are replaced by $\Psi(A)$ and $\Psi(B)$, respectively, and obtain $\|L_{B,A}\| \leq \|L_{\Psi(B), \Psi(A)}\|$. This completes the proof. $\square$

In what follows we calculate the norm of $L_{B,A}$ in terms of the reconstruction operators.

Theorem 4.4. *If $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$, then*

$$\|L_{B,A}\| = \|C_A C_B^{-1}\|,$$

where $C_X := (\Delta_X \otimes I)(I - R_X)^{-1}$ and $R_X := X_1^* \otimes R_1 + \cdots + X_n^* \otimes R_n$ is the reconstruction operator associated with the n -tuple $X := (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. Moreover, if $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ is such that $A \stackrel{H}{\prec} B$, then

$$\|L_{B,A}\| = \sup_{r \in [0,1)} \|C_{rA} C_{rB}^{-1}\|.$$

Proof. Since $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$, Theorem 1.6 from [30], implies $A \stackrel{H}{\sim} B$. Let $c \geq 1$ and assume that $P(rA, R) \leq c^2 P(rB, R)$ for any $r \in [0, 1)$. Since $\|A\| < 1$ and $\|B\| < 1$, we can take the limit, as $r \rightarrow 1$, in the operator norm topology, and obtain $P(A, R) \leq c^2 P(B, R)$. Conversely, if the latter inequality holds, then $P(A, S) \leq c^2 P(B, S)$, where $S := (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ is the n -tuple of left creation operators. Applying the noncommutative Poisson transform $\text{id} \otimes P_R$, $r \in [0, 1)$, and taking into account that it is a positive map, we deduce that $P(rA, R) \leq c^2 P(rB, R)$ for any $r \in [0, 1)$.

Now, combining (1.1) with Theorem 1.2, we deduce that

$$(4.5) \quad P(A, R) \leq c^2 P(B, R) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \|L_{B,A}\| \leq c.$$

We recall that the free pluriharmonic kernel $P(X, R)$, $X := (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$, has the factorization $P(X, R) = C_X^* C_X$, where $C_X := (\Delta_X \otimes I)(I - R_X)^{-1}$ and $R_X := X_1^* \otimes R_1 + \cdots + X_n^* \otimes R_n$ is the reconstruction operator. Note also that C_X is an invertible operator. Consequently,

$$P(A, R) \leq c^2 P(B, R) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad C_B^{*-1} C_A^* C_A C_B^{-1} \leq c^2 I.$$

Setting $c_0 := \|C_A C_B^{-1}\|$, we have $P(A, R) \leq c_0^2 P(B, R)$. Now, due to relation (4.5), we deduce that

$$\|L_{B,A}\| \leq c_0 = \|C_A C_B^{-1}\|.$$

Setting $c'_0 := \|L_{B,A}\|$ and using again (4.5), we obtain $P(A, R) \leq c_0'^2 P(B, R)$. Hence, we deduce that $C_B^{*-1} C_A^* C_A C_B^{-1} \leq c_0'^2 I$, which implies

$$\|C_A C_B^{-1}\| \leq c'_0 = \|L_{B,A}\|.$$

Therefore, $\|L_{B,A}\| = \|C_A C_B^{-1}\|$. Using the first part of this theorem and Corollary 1.4, we complete the proof. $\square$

We remark that, due to Theorem 4.4 and Corollary 1.3, we have

$$(4.6) \quad \|L_{B,A}\| = \|C_A C_B^{-1}\| = \inf\{c \geq 1 : P(A, R) \leq c^2 P(B, R)\}$$

for any $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$.

Now, let us consider the particular case when $n = 1$. Due to the remarks above and using Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 1.3, we deduce the following. Let T and T' be in $[B(\mathcal{H})]_1^-$ such that $T \stackrel{H}{\prec} T'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{T',T}\| &= \inf\{c \geq 1 : Q(rT, U) \leq c^2 Q(rT', U) \text{ for any } r \in [0, 1)\} \\ &= \inf\{c \geq 1 : K(z, T) \leq c^2 K(z, T') \text{ for any } z \in \mathbb{D}\} \\ &= \inf\{c \geq 1 : K(z, T^*) \leq c^2 K(z, T'^*) \text{ for any } z \in \mathbb{D}\} \\ &= \|L_{T'^*, T^*}\| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $T \stackrel{H}{\prec} T'$ if and only if $T^* \stackrel{H}{\prec} T'^*$. In particular, if $T, T' \in [B(\mathcal{H})]_1$, relation (4.6) implies

$$\begin{aligned} (4.7) \quad \|L_{T',T}\| &= \|L_{T'^*, T^*}\| = \|C_{T^*} C_{T'^*}^{-1}\| \\ &= \sup_{e^{it} \in \mathbb{T}} \|(I - T^* T)^{1/2} (I - e^{it} T)^{-1} (I - e^{it} T') (I - T'^* T')^{-1/2}\| \\ &= \sup_{e^{it} \in \mathbb{T}} \|(I - T'^* T')^{-1/2} (I - e^{it} T'^*) (I - e^{it} T^*)^{-1} (I - T^* T)^{1/2}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if T and T' are in $[B(\mathcal{H})]_1$ such that $T \stackrel{H}{\prec} T'$, then

$$(4.8) \quad \|L_{T',T}\| = \sup_{e^{it} \in \mathbb{T}} \|(I - T'^* T')^{-1/2} (I - e^{it} T'^*) (I - e^{it} T^*)^{-1} (I - T^* T)^{1/2}\|,$$

which is a result obtained by Suciu [33] using different methods.

Using Theorem 4.4 and relation (4.8), we can deduce the following result, which is needed in the next section.

Proposition 4.5. *If $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$, then*

$$\|L_{B,A}\| = \|L_{R_B,R_A}\| = \sup_{e^{it} \in \mathbb{T}} \left\| (I - R_B R_B^*)^{-1/2} (I - e^{it} R_B) (I - e^{it} R_A)^{-1} (I - R_A R_A^*)^{1/2} \right\|$$

where $R_X := X_1^* \otimes R_1 + \cdots + X_n^* \otimes R_n$ is the reconstruction operator.

Proof. Notice first that R_A and R_B are strict contractions. According to Theorem 4.4, using the non-commutative von Neumann inequality ([19]), and relation (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{B,A}\| &= \|\Delta_A \otimes I (I - R_A)^{-1} (I - R_B) (\Delta_B^{-1} \otimes I)\| \\ &= \sup_{e^{it} \in \mathbb{T}} \left\| (I - R_A^* R_A)^{1/2} (I - e^{it} R_A)^{-1} (I - e^{it} R_B) (I - R_B^* R_B)^{-1/2} \right\| \\ &= \|L_{R_B,R_A}\| = \|L_{R_B^*,R_A^*}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using now relation (4.8), we can complete the proof. $\square$

Taking into account Theorem 4.2, Proposition 4.3, and Theorem 4.4, one can deduce the following result from [30].

Corollary 4.6. *If $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and $A \stackrel{H}{\sim} B$, then*

$$\delta(\Psi(A), \Psi(B)) = \delta(A, B)$$

for any $\Psi \in \text{Aut}([B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1)$. Moreover, in this case we have

$$\delta(A, B) = \ln \max \left\{ \sup_{r \in [0,1)} \|C_{rA} C_{rB}^{-1}\|, \sup_{r \in [0,1)} \|C_{rB} C_{rA}^{-1}\| \right\},$$

where $C_X := (\Delta_X \otimes I)(I - R_X)^{-1}$ and $R_X := X_1^* \otimes R_1 + \cdots + X_n^* \otimes R_n$ is the reconstruction operator.

5. THE GEOMETRIC STRUCTURE OF THE OPERATOR $L_{B,A}$

This section deals with the geometric structure of the operator $L_{B,A}$. As consequences, we obtain new characterizations for the Harnack domination (resp. equivalence) in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$.

We need to recall from [17]–[21] a few facts concerning multi-analytic operators on Fock spaces. We say that a bounded linear operator A acting from $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}$ to $F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{G}$ is multi-analytic if

$$A(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}}) = (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{G}})A \quad \text{for any } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Note that A is uniquely determined by the operator $\theta : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{G}$, which is defined by $\theta k := A(1 \otimes k)$, $k \in \mathcal{K}$, and is called the symbol of A . We can associate with A a unique formal Fourier expansion

$$A \sim \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} R_{\alpha} \otimes \theta_{(\alpha)},$$

where R_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, are the right creation operators on $F^2(H_n)$, and the coefficients $\theta_{(\alpha)} \in B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{G})$, are given by

$$\langle \theta_{(\bar{\alpha})} x, y \rangle := \langle A(1 \otimes x), e_{\alpha} \otimes y \rangle, \quad x \in \mathcal{K}, \quad y \in \mathcal{G}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+.$$

Here $\tilde{\alpha}$ is the reverse of α , i.e., $\tilde{\alpha} = g_{i_k} \cdots g_{i_1}$ if $\alpha = g_{i_1} \cdots g_{i_k}$. Moreover, in this case we have

$$A = \text{SOT-}\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} r^{|\alpha|} R_{\alpha} \otimes \theta_{(\alpha)},$$

where, for each $r \in (0, 1)$, the series converges in the uniform norm. The set of all multi-analytic operators in $B(F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{K}, F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{G})$ coincides with $R_n^{\infty} \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{G})$, the WOT-closed operator space generated by the spatial tensor product. A multi-analytic operator is called inner if it is an isometry.

Let $T := [T_1, \dots, T_n]$ be a row contraction, i.e., $T_1 T_1^* + \cdots + T_n T_n^* \leq I_{\mathcal{H}}$. We recall that the defect operators associated with T are given by

$$\Delta_T := \left(I_{\mathcal{H}} - \sum_{i=1}^n T_i T_i^* \right)^{1/2} \in B(\mathcal{H}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_{T^*} := ([\delta_{ij} I_{\mathcal{H}} - T_i^* T_j]_{n \times n})^{1/2} \in B(\mathcal{H}^{(n)}),$$

while the defect spaces are $\mathcal{D}_T := \overline{\Delta_T \mathcal{H}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{T^*} := \overline{\Delta_{T^*} \mathcal{H}^{(n)}}$, where $\mathcal{H}^{(n)}$ denotes the direct sum of n copies of $\mathcal{H}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $D_{T^*, i} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}_{T^*} \subset F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$ be defined by

$$D_{T^*, i} h := 1 \otimes \Delta_{T^*} (\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i-1 \text{ times}}, h, 0, \dots).$$

Consider the Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}_T := \mathcal{H} \oplus [F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{T^*}]$ and define $V_i : \mathcal{K}_T \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_T$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, by

$$(5.1) \quad V_i(h \oplus \xi) := T_i h \oplus [D_{T^*, i} h + (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}}) \xi]$$

for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\xi \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{T^*}$. Notice that

$$(5.2) \quad V_i = \begin{bmatrix} T_i & 0 \\ D_{T^*, i} & S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{T^*}} \end{bmatrix}$$

with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{K}_T = \mathcal{H} \oplus [F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{T^*}]$. It was proved in [16] that the n -tuple $V := [V_1, \dots, V_n]$ is the minimal isometric dilation of T .

The main result of this section is the following multivariable generalization of Suciu's result from [33].

Theorem 5.1. *Let $A := [A_1, \dots, A_n]$ and $B := [B_1, \dots, B_n]$ be in $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and let $V := [V_1, \dots, V_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_A \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ and $W := [W_1, \dots, W_n]$ on $\mathcal{K}_B \supseteq \mathcal{H}$ be the minimal isometric dilations of A and B , respectively. Then $A \prec^H B$ if and only if there exist two bounded linear operators $\Omega_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ and $\Theta_0 : \mathcal{D}_{A^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:*

$$(i) \quad \Delta_{B^*} \Omega_0 = \begin{bmatrix} A_1^* - B_1^* \\ \vdots \\ A_n^* - B_n^* \end{bmatrix};$$

(ii) the map $\Omega : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ defined by

$$\Omega h := (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n R_j \otimes A_j^* \right)^k (1 \otimes h) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} e_{\alpha} \otimes \Omega_0 A_{\alpha}^* h$$

is a bounded operator;

(iii) $\Delta_{A^*} = \Delta_{B^*} \Theta_0$;

(iv) the formal series

$$I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Theta_0 + (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0) \left(I - \sum_{j=1}^n R_j \otimes A_j^* \right)^{-1} [R_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, R_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Delta_{A^*})$$

is the Fourier representation of a multi-analytic operator $\Theta : F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{A^*} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$.

In this case the operator $L_{B,A} : \mathcal{K}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_A$ satisfying $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $L_{B,A}W_i = V_i L_{B,A}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, is given by

$$(5.3) \quad L_{B,A}^* = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ \Omega & \Theta \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Assume that $A \overset{H}{\prec} B$. According to Theorem 1.2, there is a unique bounded operator $L_{B,A} : \mathcal{K}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_A$ satisfying $L_{B,A}|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $L_{B,A}W_i = V_i L_{B,A}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Consequently, due to relation (5.2), the operator $L_{B,A}^* : \mathcal{H} \oplus [F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{A^*}] \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \oplus [F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}]$ has the operator matrix representation

$$L_{B,A}^* = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ \Omega & \Theta \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\Omega : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ and $\Theta : F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{A^*} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ are bounded operators. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ \Omega & \Theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_i^* & D_{A^*,i}^* \\ 0 & S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} B_i^* & D_{B^*,i}^* \\ 0 & S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ \Omega & \Theta \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, we deduce the following relations:

$$(5.4) \quad A_i^* = B_i^* + D_{B^*,i}^* \Omega,$$

$$(5.5) \quad \Omega A_i^* = (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Omega,$$

$$(5.6) \quad D_{A^*,i}^* = D_{B^*,i}^* \Theta,$$

and

$$(5.7) \quad \Omega D_{A^*,i}^* = (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta - \Theta (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}).$$

Define $\Omega_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ by setting $\Omega_0 := J_{B^*}(P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}})\Omega$, where $J_{B^*} : \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ is the unitary operator defined by $J_{B^*}(1 \otimes d) = d$ for $d \in \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$. Let $P_i : \mathcal{H}^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be the orthogonal projection on the i -component of the direct sum $\mathcal{H}^{(n)}$. A straightforward computation shows that

$$(5.8) \quad D_{B^*,i}^* f = P_i \Delta_{B^*} J_{B^*}(P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) f, \quad f \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}.$$

A similar relation holds if B is replaced by A . Due to relations (5.8) and (5.4), we deduce that

$$P_i \Delta_{B^*} \Omega_0 = P_i \Delta_{B^*} J_{B^*}(P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Omega = D_{B^*,i}^* \Omega = A_i^* - B_i^*,$$

which implies (i). Now, since $\Omega : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ is a bounded linear operator, we have

$$(5.9) \quad \Omega h = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n} e_{\alpha} \otimes \Omega_{(\alpha)} h, \quad h \in \mathcal{H},$$

where $\Omega_{(\alpha)} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, are bounded operators with $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} \|\Omega_{(\alpha)} h\|^2 \leq C \|h\|^2$, $h \in \mathcal{H}$, for some constant $C > 0$. Since $I_{F^2(H_n)} - \sum_{i=1}^n S_i S_i^* = P_{\mathbb{C}}$, the orthogonal projection on the constants, and using relations (5.5) and (5.9), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega h &= (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0)(1 \otimes h) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}} \right) \Omega h \\ &= (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0)(1 \otimes h) + \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Omega A_i^* h \\ &= (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0)(1 \otimes h) + \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \left(\sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n} e_{\beta} \otimes \Omega_{(\beta)} A_i^* h \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n} e_\alpha \otimes \Omega_{(\alpha)} h = (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0)(1 \otimes h) + \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n} (I \otimes \Omega_{(\beta)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes A_i^* \right) (e_\beta \otimes h)$$

for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, for each $k = 1, 2, \dots$, we have

$$(5.10) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=k} e_\alpha \otimes \Omega_{(\alpha)} h = \sum_{|\beta|=k-1} (I \otimes \Omega_{(\beta)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes A_i^* \right) (e_\beta \otimes h).$$

In particular, if $k = 1$, we deduce that

$$(5.11) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n e_j \otimes \Omega_{(g_j)} h = (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n e_j \otimes A_j^* h \right).$$

Now, we prove by induction that

$$(5.12) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=m} e_\alpha \otimes \Omega_{(\alpha)} h = (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n R_j \otimes A_j^* \right)^m (1 \otimes h)$$

for any $m = 1, 2, \dots$. Assume that (5.12) holds for $m = k$. Then, due to (5.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|\alpha|=k+1} e_\alpha \otimes \Omega_{(\alpha)} h &= \sum_{|\beta|=k} (I \otimes \Omega_{(\beta)}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i \otimes A_i^* \right) (e_\beta \otimes h) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes I) \left(\sum_{|\beta|=k} e_\beta \otimes \Omega_{(\beta)} A_i^* h \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes I) (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n R_j \otimes A_j^* \right)^k (1 \otimes A_i^* h) \\ &= (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n R_j \otimes A_j^* \right)^k \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes I) (1 \otimes A_i^* h) \\ &= (I_{F^2(H_n)} \otimes \Omega_0) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n R_j \otimes A_j^* \right)^{k+1} (1 \otimes h). \end{aligned}$$

Here we also used the fact that $S_i R_j = R_j S_i$ for any $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore, relation (5.12) holds. Consequently, part (ii) follows.

To prove part (iii), let $\Theta_0 : \mathcal{D}_{A^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ be defined by

$$\Theta_0 x := J_{B^*} (P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta (1 \otimes x), \quad x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}.$$

Due to relations (5.8) and (5.6), we have

$$(5.13) \quad P_i \Delta_{A^*} J_{A^*} (P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) f = D_{A^*,i}^* f = D_{B^*,i}^* \Theta f = P_i \Delta_{B^*} J_{B^*} (P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) (\Theta f)$$

for any $f \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. In the particular case when $f = 1 \otimes x$, $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$, relation (5.13) implies $P_i \Delta_{A^*} x = P_i \Delta_{B^*} \Theta_0 x$, which proves part (iii).

On the other hand, if $f = e_\gamma \otimes x$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $|\gamma| \geq 1$, and $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$, then relation (5.13) implies $\Delta_{B^*} J_{B^*} (P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) (\Theta(e_\gamma \otimes x)) = 0$. Since Δ_{B^*} is one-to-one on $\mathcal{D}_{B^*}$, we deduce that

$$(5.14) \quad (P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) (\Theta(e_\gamma \otimes x)) = 0.$$

Now, due to relations (5.7) and (5.8), we have

$$(5.15) \quad \Omega P_i \Delta_{A^*} J_{A^*} (P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) f = \Omega D_{A^*,i}^* f = (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta f - \Theta (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) f$$

for any $f \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$. In the particular case when $f = 1 \otimes x$, $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$, relation (5.15) implies

$$(5.16) \quad \Omega P_i \Delta_{A^*} x = (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta(1 \otimes x).$$

Using relation (5.16), part (ii) of this theorem, and the fact that $I_{F^2(H_n)} - \sum_{i=1}^n S_i S_i^* = P_{\mathbb{C}}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(1 \otimes x) &= (I \otimes \Theta_0)(1 \otimes x) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n S_i S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}} \right) \Theta(1 \otimes x) \\ &= (I \otimes \Theta_0)(1 \otimes x) + \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Omega P_i \Delta_{A^*} x \\ &= (I \otimes \Theta_0)(1 \otimes x) + \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+} e_\alpha \otimes \Omega_0 A_\alpha^* P_i \Delta_{A^*} x \right) \\ &= (I \otimes \Theta_0)(1 \otimes x) + (I \otimes \Omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=k} R_{\tilde{\alpha}} \otimes A_\alpha^* \right) \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) (1 \otimes P_i \Delta_{A^*} x) \\ &= (I \otimes \Theta_0)(1 \otimes x) + (I \otimes \Omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n R_j \otimes A_j^* \right)^k [R_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, R_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] (I \otimes \Delta_{A^*})(1 \otimes x) \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$.

Now we prove that Θ is a multi-analytic operator, i.e., $\Theta(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) = (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. Using relation (5.15) when $f = e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x$ with $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$, we obtain

$$(S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta(e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x) - \Theta(S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}})(e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x) = \Omega P_i \Delta_{A^*}(0) = 0.$$

Hence, we have

$$(5.17) \quad \Theta(e_\beta \otimes x) = (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) \Theta(e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x)$$

for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. Similarly, if $i \neq j$, then (5.15) implies

$$(5.18) \quad (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta(e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x) = 0.$$

Now, using relations (5.17), (5.18), and (5.14), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x) &= (P_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta(e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n S_j S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}} \right) \Theta(e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x) \\ &= (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta(e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x) \\ &= (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta(e_\beta \otimes x). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we deduce that

$$\Theta(S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}})(e_\beta \otimes x) = (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta(e_\beta \otimes x)$$

for any $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$, which shows that Θ is a multi-analytic operator. Hence, using the calculations for $\Theta(1 \otimes x)$, and the fact that $S_i R_j = R_j S_i$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we deduce that

$$\Theta(e_\alpha \otimes x) = (I \otimes \Theta_0)(e_\alpha \otimes x) + (I \otimes \Omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n R_j \otimes A_j^* \right)^k [R_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, R_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] (I \otimes \Delta_{A^*})(e_\alpha \otimes x)$$

for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$. Therefore, Θ is a multi-analytic operator with Fourier representation given in part (iv).

Now, we prove the converse of this theorem. Assume that there exit two bounded linear operators $\Omega_0 : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ and $\Theta_0 : \mathcal{D}_{A^*} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{B^*}$ such that the conditions (i)-(iv) are satisfied. Let $X : \mathcal{K}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_A$ be defined by

$$X^* := \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ \Omega & \Theta \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $X|_{\mathcal{H}} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$, due to Theorem 1.2, it remains to show that $XW_i = V_iX$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. As we saw at the beginning of this proof, it is enough to show that that relations (5.4), (5.5), (5.6), and (5.7) hold.

First, notice that condition (i) implies $P_i \Delta_{B^*} \Omega_0 = A_i^* - B_i^*$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Using relation (5.8) and part (ii), we deduce (5.4). Similarly, conditions (iii) and (iv) imply (5.6). To prove (5.5), note that, using condition (ii) and the fact that $S_i^* S_j = \delta_{ij} I$ for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Omega &= (S_i^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) (I \otimes \Omega_0) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\alpha|=k} (S_{\alpha} \otimes A_{\alpha}^*) (1 \otimes h) \right) \\ &= (I \otimes \Omega_0) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{|\beta|=k} (S_{\beta} \otimes A_{\beta}^*) (1 \otimes A_i^* h) \right) \\ &= \Omega A_i^* h \end{aligned}$$

for any $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. It remains to prove relation (5.7).

Let $f = e_{g_i \beta} \otimes x$ with $\beta \in \mathbb{F}_n^+$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$. Note that, since Θ is multi-analytic operator and $S_j^* S_i = \delta_{ij} I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta f - \Theta (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) f &= (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta (S_i S_{\beta} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) (1 \otimes x) - \Theta (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) (S_i S_{\beta} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) (1 \otimes x) \\ &= (\delta_{ij} I \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta (S_{\beta} \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) (1 \otimes x) - \Theta (\delta_{ij} I \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) (e_{\beta} \otimes x) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

and $\Omega D_{A^*,i}^* f = \Omega P_j \Delta(0) = 0$. Therefore, in this case, we have

$$(S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta f - \Theta (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) f = \Omega D_{A^*,i}^* f = 0.$$

Note also that part (iv) and part (ii) imply

$$\begin{aligned} (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) \Theta (1 \otimes x) - \Theta (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{A^*}}) (1 \otimes x) &= (S_j^* \otimes I_{\mathcal{D}_{B^*}}) (I \otimes \Omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left[\left(\sum_{p=1}^n R_p \otimes A_p^* \right)^k [R_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, R_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] (I \otimes \Delta_{A^*}) (1 \otimes x) \right] \\ &= (S_j^* \otimes \Omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left[\left(\sum_{p=1}^n R_p \otimes A_p^* \right)^k [S_1 \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, S_n \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}] (1 \otimes \Delta_{A^*} x) \right] \\ &= (S_j^* \otimes \Omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left[\left(\sum_{p=1}^n R_p \otimes A_p^* \right)^k \sum_{i=1}^n (S_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}}) (1 \otimes P_i \Delta_{A^*} x) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (S_j^* S_i \otimes \Omega_0) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left[\left(\sum_{p=1}^n R_p \otimes A_p^* \right)^k (1 \otimes P_i \Delta_{A^*} x) \right] \\ &= \Omega (P_j \Delta_{A^*} x) = \Omega D_{A^*,j}^* (1 \otimes x) \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{D}_{A^*}$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore, relation (5.7) holds. The proof is complete. $\square$

If $L_{B,A}^*$ is given by relation (5.3), we set $\Omega_{B,A} := \Omega$ and $\Theta_{B,A} := \Theta$. Using Theorem 5.1, one can easily obtain the following result.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $A, B, C \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$.*

- (i) *If $A \overset{H}{\prec} B$ and $B \overset{H}{\prec} C$, then $A \overset{H}{\prec} C$. In this case, we have*

$$L_{C,A}^* = L_{C,B}^* L_{B,A}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_{C,A} = \Theta_{C,B} \Theta_{B,A}.$$

- (ii) *If $A \overset{H}{\prec} B$ then $A \overset{H}{\sim} B$ if and only if $\Theta_{B,A}$ is an invertible multi-analytic operator. In this case, we have*

$$\Theta_{B,A}^{-1} = \Theta_{A,B}.$$

Consider now the particular case when $A, B \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$ and $B = 0$. Note that Theorem 5.1 implies $\Omega_0 = \begin{bmatrix} A_1^* \\ \vdots \\ A_n^* \end{bmatrix}$ and $\Theta_0 = \Delta_{A^*}$. In this case, one can use Theorem 5.1 and some results from [30] to obtain the following consequences. We recall that the joint spectral radius associated with an n -tuple of operators $X := (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in B(\mathcal{H})^n$ is given by

$$r(X) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{|\alpha|=k} X_\alpha X_\alpha^* \right\|^{1/2k}.$$

Moreover, $r(X)$ is equal to the spectral radius of the reconstruction operator $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i^* \otimes R_i$.

Corollary 5.3. *If $A \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $A \overset{H}{\prec} 0$;
- (ii) $\Omega_{0,A}$ and $\Theta_{0,A}$ are bounded operators;
- (iii) the joint spectral radius $r(A) < 1$.

We remark that when $n = 1$, the equivalence (i) $\leftrightarrow$ (iii) was obtained by Ando-Suciu-Timotin in [1] and the equivalence (i) $\leftrightarrow$ (ii) was obtained by Suciu in [33].

Corollary 5.4. *If $A \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1^-$, then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $A \overset{H}{\sim} 0$;
- (ii) $\Omega_{0,A}$ is bounded and $\Theta_{0,A}$ is invertible;
- (iii) $A \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$.

We remark that when $n = 1$, the equivalence (i) $\leftrightarrow$ (iii) was obtained by Foias in [8] and the equivalence (i) $\leftrightarrow$ (ii) was obtained by Suciu in [33].

6. SCHWARZ-PICK LEMMA WITH RESPECT TO THE HYPERBOLIC DISTANCE

In this section, we obtain a Schwartz-Pick lemma for contractive free holomorphic functions F on $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ with respect to the intertwining operator $L_{B,A}$. As a consequence, we deduce that

$$\delta(F(z), F(\xi)) \leq \delta(z, \xi), \quad z, \xi \in \mathbb{B}_n,$$

where δ is the hyperbolic distance.

We recall that a free holomorphic function $G : [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}) \otimes_{\min} B(\mathcal{E})$ is bounded if

$$\|G\|_\infty := \sup \|G(X_1, \dots, X_n)\| < \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all n -tuples of operators $[X_1, \dots, X_n] \in [B(\mathcal{K})^n]_1$ and $\mathcal{K}$ is an infinite dimensional Hilbert space. We know that (see [26], [29]) a bounded free holomorphic function G is uniquely determined by its boundary function $\tilde{G}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \in R_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{E})$ defined by

$$\tilde{G}(R_1, \dots, R_n) = \text{SOT-} \lim_{r \rightarrow 1} G(rR_1, \dots, rR_n).$$

Moreover, G is essentially the noncommutative Poisson transform of $\tilde{G}(R_1, \dots, R_n)$.

First, we need the following result.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $F_j : [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}) \otimes_{\min} B(\mathcal{E})$, $j = 1, \dots, m$, be free holomorphic functions with coefficients in $B(\mathcal{E})$, and assume that $F := (F_1, \dots, F_m)$ is a contractive free holomorphic function. If $W \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$, then $F(0) \stackrel{H}{\prec} F(W)$ and*

$$\|L_{F(W), F(0)}\| \leq \left(\frac{1 + \|W\|}{1 - \|W\|} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. First, we prove the theorem when F is a strictly contractive free holomorphic function. According to Lemma 1.2 from [28], we must have $\|\tilde{F}(rR_1, \dots, rR_n)\| < 1$ for any $r \in [0, 1)$, where $\tilde{F}(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ is the boundary function of F . Denote by $\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_m$ the right creation operators on the full Fock space with m generators, $F^2(H_m)$. Define the free holomorphic function $\Psi : [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}) \otimes_{\min} B(\mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m))$ by

$$(6.1) \quad \Psi(X_1, \dots, X_n) := \sum_{j=1}^m F_j(X_1, \dots, X_n) \otimes \mathbf{R}_j^*, \quad (X_1, \dots, X_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1.$$

Since $\mathbf{R}_j^* \mathbf{R}_p = \delta_{pj} I$, $p, j = 1, \dots, m$, the boundary function $\tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \in B(F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m))$ has the property that

$$\|\tilde{\Psi}(rR_1, \dots, rR_n)\| = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{F}_j(rR_1, \dots, rR_n) \tilde{F}_j(rR_1, \dots, rR_n)^* \right\|^{1/2} = \|\tilde{F}(rR_1, \dots, rR_n)\| < 1$$

for any $r \in [0, 1)$. Therefore, Ψ is a strictly contractive free holomorphic function. In particular, we have $\|\tilde{\Psi}(0)\| < 1$.

Let $\Gamma : [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1 \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}) \otimes_{\min} B(\mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m))$ be the bounded free holomorphic function having the boundary function

$$(6.2) \quad \tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) := -\tilde{\Psi}(0) + D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*} \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \left[I - \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right]^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)},$$

where $D_Y := (I - Y^* Y)^{1/2}$. Note that Γ is a bounded free holomorphic function with $\Gamma(0) = 0$. Moreover, one can prove that Γ is contractive. Indeed, for each $y \in F^2(H_n) \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)$ set

$$\omega := \left[I - \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right]^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)} y.$$

Since $\begin{bmatrix} -\tilde{\Psi}(0) & D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*} \\ D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)} & \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \end{bmatrix}$ is a unitary operator and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) y \\ D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)} y + \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \omega \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\tilde{\Psi}(0) & D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*} \\ D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)} & \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \omega \end{bmatrix}$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) y\| &= \|y\|^2 + \left\| \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \omega \right\|^2 - \left\| D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)} y + \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \omega \right\|^2 \\ &= \|y\|^2 - \left(\|\omega\|^2 - \left\| \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \omega \right\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $\tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ is a contraction, we deduce that $\tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n)$ is a contraction. Therefore, Γ is a contractive free holomorphic function with $\Gamma(0) = 0$. Due to a noncommutative version of Gleason problem (see Theorem 2.4 from [26]), we have

$$(6.3) \quad \tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)}) \tilde{\Lambda}_i(R_1, \dots, R_n),$$

for some free holomorphic functions Λ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, with coefficients in $B(\mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m))$ and such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\Lambda}_i(R_1, \dots, R_n)^* \tilde{\Lambda}_i(R_1, \dots, R_n) \leq I$.

Now, a closer look at relation (6.2) reveals that (we recall that $D_{Y^*}Y = YD_Y$)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) &= D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*}^{-1} \left\{ -D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*} \tilde{\Psi}(0) D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)}^{-1} \left[I - \tilde{\Psi}(0) \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right] + D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*}^2 \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right\} \\ &\quad \times \left[I - \tilde{\Psi}(0) \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right]^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)} \\ &= D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*}^{-1} \left[\tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) - \tilde{\Psi}(0) \right] \left[I - \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right]^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) = \left[\tilde{\Psi}(0) + D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*} \tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)}^{-1} \right] \left[I + D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*} \tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)}^{-1} \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \right]^{-1},$$

which, taking into account that $Y^*D_{Y^*} = D_Y Y^*$, implies

$$\tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) = \tilde{\Psi}(0) + D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*} \tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \left[I + \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \tilde{\Gamma}(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right]^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)}.$$

Now, using relation (6.3) and the fact the operators $\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*$ and $D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*}$ are commuting with $R_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}(R_1, \dots, R_n) &= \tilde{\Psi}(0) + \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (R_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)}) D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)^*} \tilde{\Lambda}_i(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right] \\ &\quad \times \left[I + \sum_{i=1}^n (R_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)}) \tilde{\Psi}(0)^* \tilde{\Lambda}_i(R_1, \dots, R_n) \right]^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Psi}(0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, fix $W := (W_1, \dots, W_n) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. Using the F_n^∞ -functional calculus for row contractions [20], the latter relation implies

$$(6.4) \quad \Psi(W) = \Psi(0) + D_{\Psi(0)^*} Z [I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)},$$

where

$$(6.5) \quad Z := \sum_{i=1}^n (W_i \otimes I_{\mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)}) \Lambda_i(W_1, \dots, W_n).$$

Since $\begin{bmatrix} \Psi(0) & D_{\Psi(0)^*} \\ D_{\Psi(0)} & -\Psi(0)^* \end{bmatrix}$ is a unitary operator and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi(W)x \\ D_{\Psi(0)}x - \Psi(0)^* Z [I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Psi(0) & D_{\Psi(0)^*} \\ D_{\Psi(0)} & -\Psi(0)^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ Z [I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x \end{bmatrix},$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi(W)x\|^2 &= \|x\|^2 + \|Z [I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x\|^2 - \|D_{\Psi(0)}x - \Psi(0)^* Z [I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x\|^2 \\ &= \|x\|^2 + \|Z [I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x\|^2 - \|[I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\|[I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x\|^2 = \|D_{\Psi(W)}x\|^2 + \|Z [I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x\|^2,$$

which implies

$$\|[I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}x\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|Z\|^2} \|D_{\Psi(W)}x\|^2$$

for any $x \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)$. Since Ψ is a strictly contractive free holomorphic function, $\|\Psi(W)\| < 1$. Consequently, $D_{\Psi(W)}$ is invertible and the latter inequality implies

$$(6.6) \quad \|[I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} y\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{1 - \|Z\|^2} \|y\|^2$$

for any $y \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E} \otimes F^2(H_m)$.

Since F is a strictly contractive free holomorphic function, $F(0)$ and $F(W)$ are strict row contractions in $B(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E})^m$. Applying Proposition 4.5, we obtain

$$\|L_{F(W), F(0)}\| = \sup_{e^{it} \in \mathbb{T}} \left\| (I - \mathbf{R}_{F(W)} \mathbf{R}_{F(W)}^*)^{-1/2} (I - e^{it} \mathbf{R}_{F(W)}) (I - e^{it} \mathbf{R}_{F(0)})^{-1} (I - \mathbf{R}_{F(0)} \mathbf{R}_{F(0)}^*)^{1/2} \right\|$$

where $\mathbf{R}_X := X_1^* \otimes \mathbf{R}_1 + \cdots + X_m^* \otimes \mathbf{R}_m$ is the reconstruction operator associated with the m -tuple $(X_1, \dots, X_m) \in [B(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{E})^m]_1$. Now, using relation (6.1), one can see that $\Psi(0) = \mathbf{R}_{F(0)}^*$ and $\Psi(W) = \mathbf{R}_{F(W)}^*$. Therefore, the latter equality becomes

$$(6.7) \quad \|L_{F(W), F(0)}\| = \sup_{e^{it} \in \mathbb{T}} \left\| D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} [I - e^{it} \Psi(W)^*] [I - e^{it} \Psi(0)^*]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} \right\|.$$

Now, we need to calculate the right hand side of this equality. Note that, using the formula (6.4) for $\Psi(W)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} [I - e^{it} \Psi(W)^*] [I - e^{it} \Psi(0)^*]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} \\ &= D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} \{I - e^{it} \Psi(0)^* - e^{it} D_{\Psi(0)} [I + Z^* \Psi(0)]^{-1} Z^* D_{\Psi(0)}^*\} [I - e^{it} \Psi(0)^*]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} \\ &= D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} - e^{it} D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} [I + Z^* \Psi(0)]^{-1} Z^* D_{\Psi(0)}^* [I - e^{it} \Psi(0)^*]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} \\ &= D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} [I + Z^* \Psi(0)]^{-1} \{I + Z^* \Psi(0) - e^{it} Z^* D_{\Psi(0)}^* [I - e^{it} \Psi(0)^*]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}\} \\ &= D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} [I + Z^* \Psi(0)]^{-1} [I + Z^* \Theta_{\Psi(0)}(e^{it})], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Theta_{\Psi(0)}(e^{it}) := \Psi(0) - e^{it} D_{\Psi(0)}^* [I - e^{it} \Psi(0)^*]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)}, \quad e^{it} \in \mathbb{T},$$

is the Nagy-Foiaş characteristic function of the contraction $\Psi(0)$ (see [34]), which is contractive. Consequently, relation (6.7) and inequality (6.6) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{F(W), F(0)}\|^2 &= \sup_{e^{it} \in \mathbb{T}} \left\| [I + \Theta_{\Psi(0)}(e^{it})^* Z] [I + \Psi(0)^* Z]^{-1} D_{\Psi(0)} D_{\Psi(W)}^{-1} \right\|^2 \\ &\leq (1 + \|Z\|)^2 \frac{1}{1 - \|Z\|^2} = \frac{1 + \|Z\|}{1 - \|Z\|}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to relations (6.5) and (6.3), and the noncommutative von Neumann inequality ([19]), we have $\|Z\| \leq \|W\|$. Consequently, the inequality above implies

$$\|L_{F(W), F(0)}\| \leq \left(\frac{1 + \|W\|}{1 - \|W\|} \right)^{1/2},$$

which proves the theorem when F is strictly contractive.

Now we consider the general case when F is a contractive free holomorphic function. Then note that $F_r := rF$, $r \in [0, 1)$, is strictly contractive and, therefore, $\|L_{rF(W), rF(0)}\| \leq \left(\frac{1 + \|W\|}{1 - \|W\|} \right)^{1/2}$, for any $r \in [0, 1)$. According to Theorem 1.4, we have $F(0) \overset{H}{\prec} F(W)$ and

$$\|L_{F(W), F(0)}\| = \sup_{r \in [0, 1)} \|L_{rF(W), rF(0)}\| \leq \left(\frac{1 + \|W\|}{1 - \|W\|} \right)^{1/2}$$

for any $W \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. The proof is complete. $\square$

We recall a few facts concerning the involutive automorphisms of the unit ball $\mathbb{B}_n$ (see [31]). Let $a \in \mathbb{B}_n$ and consider $\varphi_a \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{B}_n)$, the automorphism of the unit ball, defined by

$$(6.8) \quad \varphi_a(z) := \frac{a - Q_a z - s_a (I - Q_a) z}{1 - \langle z, a \rangle}, \quad z \in \mathbb{B}_n,$$

where $Q_0 = 0$, $Q_a z := \frac{\langle z, a \rangle}{\langle a, a \rangle} a$ if $a \neq 0$, and $s_a := (1 - \langle a, a \rangle)^{1/2}$. The automorphism φ_a has the following properties:

- (i) $\varphi_a(0) = a$ and $\varphi_a(a) = 0$;

- (ii) $\varphi_a(\varphi_a(z)) = z, \quad z \in \mathbb{B}_n;$
- (iii) $1 - \|\varphi_a(z)\|_2^2 = \frac{(1 - \|a\|_2^2)(1 - \|z\|_2^2)}{|1 - \langle z, a \rangle|^2}, \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}_n.$

Theorem 6.2. *Let $F := (F_1, \dots, F_m)$ be a contractive free holomorphic function with coefficients in $B(\mathcal{E})$. If $z, \xi \in \mathbb{B}_n$, then $F(z) \stackrel{H}{\sim} F(\xi)$ and*

$$\|L_{F(z), F(\xi)}\| \leq \|L_{z, \xi}\| = \left(\frac{1 + \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2}{1 - \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2} \right)^{1/2},$$

where φ_z is the involutive automorphism of $\mathbb{B}_n$ which takes 0 into z . Moreover,

$$\delta(F(z), F(\xi)) \leq \delta(z, \xi)$$

for any $z, \xi \in \mathbb{B}_n$, where δ is the hyperbolic metric defined by (4.1).

Proof. For simplicity, if $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{B}_n$ we also use the notation $z = (z_1 I_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, z_n I_{\mathcal{H}}) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. Let Ψ_z be the involutive automorphism of $[B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$ which takes 0 into z (see [28]) and let $W := \Psi_z(\xi) \in [B(\mathcal{H})^n]_1$. According to [28], $\Phi := F \circ \Psi_z$ is a contractive free holomorphic function such that $\Phi(0) = F(z)$ and $\Phi(W) = F(\xi)$. Using Theorem 6.1, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{F(\xi), F(z)}\| &= \|L_{\Phi(W), \Phi(0)}\| \leq \left(\frac{1 + \|W\|}{1 - \|W\|} \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left(\frac{1 + \|\Psi_z(\xi)\|}{1 - \|\Psi_z(\xi)\|} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

According to [28], Ψ_z is a noncommutative extension of the involutive automorphism of $\mathbb{B}_n$ that interchanges 0 and z , i.e., $\Psi_z(x) = \varphi_z(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{B}_n$. Since $\|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2 = \|\varphi_\xi(z)\|_2$, we deduce that

$$(6.9) \quad \max\{\|L_{F(z), F(\xi)}\|, \|L_{F(\xi), F(z)}\|\} \leq \left(\frac{1 + \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2}{1 - \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Note that due to Proposition 4.3 and Theorem 4.4, we have

$$\|L_{\xi, z}\| = \|L_{\varphi_z(\varphi_z(\xi)), \varphi_z(0)}\| = \|L_{\varphi_z(\xi), 0}\| = \|C_{\varphi_z(\xi)}^{-1}\|.$$

On the other hand, it was proved in [30] that $\|C_\lambda^{-1}\| = \left(\frac{1 + \|\lambda\|_2}{1 - \|\lambda\|_2} \right)^{1/2}$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_n$. Combining these relations, we deduce that

$$\|L_{\xi, z}\| = \|L_{z, \xi}\| = \left(\frac{1 + \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2}{1 - \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2} \right)^{1/2}.$$

According to [30], $\delta|_{\mathbb{B}_n \times \mathbb{B}_n}$ coincides with the Poincaré-Bergman distance on $\mathbb{B}_n$, i.e.,

$$(6.10) \quad \delta(z, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1 + \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2}{1 - \|\varphi_z(\xi)\|_2}, \quad z, \xi \in \mathbb{B}_n,$$

Using relations (6.9), (6.10), and applying Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 4.2, we deduce that $F(z) \stackrel{H}{\sim} F(\xi)$ and $\delta(F(z), F(\xi)) \leq \delta(z, \xi)$. This completes the proof. $\square$

It is well-known (see [24], [26], [29]) that if $F := (F_1, \dots, F_m)$ is a contractive ($\|F\|_\infty \leq 1$) free holomorphic function with coefficients in $B(\mathcal{E})$, then its boundary function is in $R_n^\infty \bar{\otimes} B(\mathcal{E}^{(m)}, \mathcal{E})$ and, consequently, the evaluation map $\mathbb{B}_n \ni z \mapsto F(z) \in B(\mathcal{E})^{(m)}$ is a contractive operator-valued multiplier of the Drury-Arveson space ([6], [2]). Moreover, any such a contractive multiplier has this kind of representation.

Finally, we remark that, in the particular case when $m = n = 1$, the second part of Theorem 6.2 implies Suciu's result [33].

REFERENCES

- [1] T. ANDO, I. SUCIU, D. TIMOTIN, Characterization of some Harnack parts of contractions, *J. Operator Theory* **2** (1979), no. 2, 233–245.
- [2] W.B. ARVESON, Subalgebras of C^* -algebras III: Multivariable operator theory, *Acta Math.* **181** (1998), 159–228.
- [3] S. BERGMAN, *The kernel function and conformal mapping*, Mathematical Surveys, No. V. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1970. x+257 pp.
- [4] J. W. BUNCE, Models for n -tuples of noncommuting operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* **57**(1984), 21–30.
- [5] J. CUNTZ, Simple C^* -algebras generated by isometries, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **57** (1977), 173–185.
- [6] S. DRURY, A generalization of von Neumann’s inequality to the complex ball, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **68** (1978), 300–304.
- [7] E.G. EFFROS AND Z.J. RUAN, *Operator spaces*, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, **23**. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 2000.
- [8] C. FOIAŞ, On Harnack parts of contractions. *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl.* **19** (1974), 315–318.
- [9] A. E. FRAZHO, Models for noncommuting operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* **48** (1982), 1–11.
- [10] A.M. GLEASON, *Function algebras*, Seminars on Analytic Functions, Vol. 2, Institute for advanced Study, Princeton, N.J., 1957.
- [11] S. KOBAYASHI, *Hyperbolic complex spaces*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 318. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. xiv+471 pp.
- [12] S. KOBAYASHI, *Hyperbolic manifolds and holomorphic mappings*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2005. xii+148 pp.
- [13] S.G. KRANTZ, *Geometric function theory*, Explorations in complex analysis. Cornerstones. Birkhuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2006. xiv+314 pp.
- [14] V.I. PAULSEN, *Completely Bounded Maps and Dilations*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics, Vol.146, New York, 1986.
- [15] G. PISIER, *Similarity Problems and Completely Bounded Maps*, Springer Lect. Notes Math., Vol.1618, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [16] G. POPESCU, Isometric dilations for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **316** (1989), 523–536.
- [17] G. POPESCU, Characteristic functions for infinite sequences of noncommuting operators, *J. Operator Theory* **22** (1989), 51–71.
- [18] G. POPESCU, Multi-analytic operators and some factorization theorems, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **38** (1989), 693–710.
- [19] G. POPESCU, Von Neumann inequality for $(B(H)^n)_1$, *Math. Scand.* **68** (1991), 292–304.
- [20] G. POPESCU, Functional calculus for noncommuting operators, *Michigan Math. J.* **42** (1995), 345–356.
- [21] G. POPESCU, Multi-analytic operators on Fock spaces, *Math. Ann.* **303** (1995), 31–46.
- [22] G. POPESCU, Positive-definite functions on free semigroups, *Canad. J. Math.* **48** (1996), no. 4, 887–896.
- [23] G. POPESCU, Noncommutative disc algebras and their representations, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **124** (1996), 2137–2148.
- [24] G. POPESCU, Poisson transforms on some C^* -algebras generated by isometries, *J. Funct. Anal.* **161** (1999), 27–61.
- [25] G. POPESCU, Curvature invariant for Hilbert modules over free semigroup algebras, *Adv. Math.* **158** (2001), 264–309.
- [26] G. POPESCU, Free holomorphic functions on the unit ball of $B(\mathcal{H})^n$, *J. Funct. Anal.* **241** (2006), 268–333.
- [27] G. POPESCU, Unitary invariants in multivariable operator theory, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, to appear.
- [28] G. POPESCU, Free holomorphic automorphisms of the unit ball of $B(\mathcal{H})^n$, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, to appear.
- [29] G. POPESCU, Noncommutative transforms and free pluriharmonic functions, preprint 2007.
- [30] G. POPESCU, Noncommutative hyperbolic geometry on the unit ball of $B(\mathcal{H})^n$, preprint 2008.
- [31] W. RUDIN, *Function theory in the unit ball of $\mathbb{C}^n$* , Springer-verlag, New-York/Berlin, 1980.
- [32] I. SUCIU, Analytic relations between functional models for contractions, *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **34** (1973), 359–365.
- [33] I. SUCIU, Analytic formulas for the hyperbolic distance between two contractions, *Ann. Polon. Math.* **66** (1997), 239–252.
- [34] B. SZ.-NAGY AND C. FOIAŞ, *Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space*, North Holland, New York 1970.
- [35] J. VON NEUMANN, Eine Spectraltheorie für allgemeine Operatoren eines unitären Raumes, *Math. Nachr.* **4** (1951), 258–281.
- [36] K. ZHU, *Spaces of holomorphic functions in the unit ball*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 226. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005. x+271 pp.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78249, USA
 E-mail address: gelu.popescu@utsa.edu